

PRG



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,204	06/13/2000	Charu Aneja	RCA 89,652	7412

7590 12/04/2002
Joseph S Tripoli
Patent Operations
Thomson Multimedia Licensing Inc
P O Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER
SINGH, DALIP K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2676

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PRG

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/592,204

Applicant(s)

ANEJA ET AL.

Examiner

Dalip K Singh

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,020,003 to Moshenberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,489,947 to Cooper.

- a. Regarding claim 1, Moshenberg **discloses** a method of storing a pixel map (pixel values) in a memory (frame buffer 230 memory) (...an image...is defined by storing the pixel values...frame buffer 230 memory locations...col. 2, lines 40-50). Moshenberg **does not disclose** storing a plurality of different headers associated with the pixel map in the memory; and selecting a header defining a desired display characteristic for the pixel map. Cooper **discloses** storing a plurality of different headers associated with the pixel map in the memory (...the graphic image...words are ...stored in OSD section 1513-3 of RAM 1513...in the form of header for the bit map...col. 6, lines 43-46); and selecting a header defining a desired display characteristic for the pixel map (...OSD display unit 1509-9 requests data from OSD section...via memory controller ...as required...col. 6, lines 57-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Moshenberg with the feature "component groups as different headers and selecting them as required" as taught

Art Unit: 2676

by Cooper because it affords a flexible means to control colors of a graphic image depending on the nature of graphics image to be displayed (col. 6, lines 49-52).

b. Regarding claim 2, Moshenberg **is silent about** the step of: processing the selected header and associated pixel map to generate an image in a displayable format. However, Cooper **discloses** processing the selected header and associated pixel map to generate an image in a displayable format (...OSD display unit 1509-9 causes the bit map to be read out...converts the color representative word for each pixel ...from the header...col. 6, lines 53-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Moshenberg with the feature “processing the selected header and generate an image” as taught by Cooper because it affords a flexible means to control colors of a graphic image depending on the nature of graphics image to be displayed (col. 6, lines 49-52).

c. Regarding claim 3, Moshenberg **is silent about** the pixel map being associated with an on-screen display (OSD) data structure. Cooper **discloses** pixel map being associated with an on-screen display (OSD) data structure (...the graphic image...words are ...stored in OSD section 1513-3 of RAM 1513...in the form of header for the bit map...col. 6, lines 43-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Moshenberg with the feature “pixel map associated with an OSD data structure” as taught by Cooper because it affords a flexible means to control colors of a graphic image depending on the nature of graphics image to be displayed (col. 6, lines 49-52).

Art Unit: 2676

d. Regarding claim 4, Moshenberg is **silent about** the desired display characteristic being at least one of a presence or absence of a side panel, a YUV or YIQ colorimetry, a degree of transparency, an image size, an interlaced or progressive display format, a color scheme, an aspect ratio, a blending ratio, a resolution factor, a number of bits per pixel, a compression factor, a horizontal pixel duplication value, and a vertical pixel duplication value. Cooper **discloses** desired display characteristic (video image component representative groups) being as luminance representative word and color difference representative words and **does not disclose** side panel, a YUV or YIQ colorimetry, degree of transparency, an image size, an interlaced or progressive display format, a color scheme, an aspect ratio, a blending ratio, a resolution factor, a number of bits per pixel, a compression factor, a horizontal pixel duplication value, and a vertical pixel duplication value in particular as per the instant claim 4. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Moshenberg with the features “side panel, a YUV or YIQ colorimetry, degree of transparency, an image size, an interlaced or progressive display format, a color scheme, an aspect ratio, a blending ratio, a resolution factor, a number of bits per pixel, a compression factor, a horizontal pixel duplication value, and a vertical pixel duplication value in the headers” as taught by Cooper because it affords a flexible means to control colors of a graphic image depending on the nature of graphics image to be displayed (col. 6, lines 49-52).

e. Regarding claim 5, it is similar in scope to claim 1 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

- f. Regarding claim 6, Cooper **discloses** the image is an on-screen display (...the graphic image...are transmitted...in OSD section 1513-3 of RAM 1513...col. 6, lines 44-59).
- g. Regarding claim 7, it is similar in scope to claim 4 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- h. Regarding claim 8, Cooper **discloses** for each pixel of the graphic image there is digital word representing a color for that pixel (col. 6, lines 1-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Moshenberg with the feature “for the each display characteristic is a unique set of display characteristics” as taught by Cooper because it affords a flexible means to control colors of a graphic image depending on the nature of graphics image to be displayed (col. 6, lines 49-52).
- i. Regarding claim 9, Cooper **discloses** storing the data structure in the memory prior to the receipt of the image display request (...the graphic image component...words are ...stored in OSD section 1513-3 of RAM 1513...col. 6, lines 43-52).
- j. Regarding claim 10, Cooper **discloses** the image data structure is one of a plurality of image data structures stored in the memory (.....the graphic image component...words are ...stored in OSD section 1513-3 of RAM 1513...col. 6, lines 43-52).
- k. Regarding claim 11, Cooper **discloses** the image data in the image block of the image data structure is a pixel map (...stored in OSD section...of RAM 1513...in the form of a header for the bit map...col. 6, lines 43-46).

Art Unit: 2676

- l. Regarding claim 12, it is similar in scope to claim 5 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- m. Regarding claim 13, it is similar in scope to claim 7 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- n. Regarding claim 14, it is similar in scope to claim 11 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- o. Regarding claim 15, it is similar in scope to claim 12 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- p. Regarding claim 16, Cooper **discloses** a display unit (Figure 1, Television Receiver) coupled to the processing circuitry for displaying the image generated by the processing circuitry.
- q. Regarding claim 17, it is similar in scope to claim 11 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- r. Regarding claim 18, it is similar in scope to claim 13 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- s. Regarding claim 19, it is similar in scope to claim 6 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- t. Regarding claim 20, it is similar in scope to claim 8 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- u. Regarding claim 21, Moshenberg **does not disclose** an on-screen display memory comprising: a first region containing a pixel map; a second region containing a plurality of different headers respectively defining different display characteristics for the pixel

Art Unit: 2676

map; and a control port for selecting a desired one of the different headers. However, Cooper **discloses** an on-screen display memory comprising: a first region containing a pixel map (video ram 1513); a second region containing a plurality of different headers respectively defining different display characteristics for the pixel map (OSD bit map with header 1513-3); and a control port (memory controller 1509-3) for selecting a desired one of the different headers (Figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Moshenberg with the feature "segmented memory regions" as taught by Cooper because it affords a flexible means to control colors of a graphic image depending on the nature of graphics image to be displayed (col. 6, lines 49-52).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Dalip K. Singh** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3895**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu (8:00AM-6:30PM) Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Matthew Bella**, can be reached at **(703) 308-6829**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Art Unit: 2676

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) 305-0377.

dks

November 29, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Matthew C. Bella'.

Matthew C. Bella
Primary Examiner